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Terror management theory proposes that humans, able to envision their inevitable death, develop worldviews opposing this debilitating fear. One TMT implication of considerable interest is its connection with the formation of religious belief. Taking a religious culture approach, this study measured the effect of death reminders on self-reported religiosity among 131 Orthodox Jews, and examined if Baal Teshuva—"returnees" differed from individuals born into Orthodox Judaism. Results showed that death reminders had a varied effect—both Baal Teshuva and those with intra-Orthodox religious change reported higher levels of intrinsic religiosity, while those without change reported lower. Explanations for these intra-faith differences relate to attachment theory and possible "Compensation" among those with religious change.
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Terror management function of Orthodox Jewish religiosity: A religious culture approach

Terror management theory (TMT; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 1998) proposes that humans, because of their vast cognitive capacities, are uniquely able to envision their own inevitable death, and consequently live in the shadow of a relentless and potentially debilitating fear of their mortality. Thus, they develop collective worldviews, both secular and religious, that offer meaning, purpose, as well as transcendence, to those adhering to their cultural mandate (Landau, Greenberg, & Solomon, 2004). TMT also includes a complex psychodynamic account of how death reminders (termed mortality salience, or MS) are processed. Specifically, TMT explains that although initially MS is successfully repressed, and therefore is not arousing or frightening, death anxiety later re-emerges transformed into reinforced cultural worldviews that provide the prescription for a secure existence (Solomon et al., 1998). Over the past 20 years, over 300 studies have explored the effects of MS on a wide range of behaviours and cognitions such as aggression, stereotyping, sexuality, group identification, and legal judgments (Cox & Arndt, 2006). Results have consistently supported many of the key theoretical propositions of TMT (Landau et al., 2004).

One implication of TMT that has raised considerable interest is the connection between TMT and the formation of religious belief, since faith may provide meaning, purpose, and
even the perception of literal immortality. In fact, speculation about death and religion predates TMT (Norenzayan & Hansen, 2006) and abundant research exists exploring the correlation of religious beliefs and death anxiety. This literature, however, exhibits somewhat mixed results leading many to point out the multidimensional nature of religiosity, which hinders construction of consistent measures (Cohen et al., 2005; Falkenhain & Handal, 2003; Harding, Flannelly, Weaver, & Costa, 2005), and to possible interfaith and denominational variance (Cohen et al., 2005; Kahoe & Dunn, 1975; Maltby & Day, 2000). Despite these criticisms, it is generally agreed that Allport and Ross’ (1967) intrinsic religiosity, defined as internally motivated true belief, appears protective to some extent against death anxiety in a variety of contexts (Alvarado, Templer, Bresler, & Thomas-Dobson, 1995; Cohen et al., 2005; Falkenhain & Handal, 2003; Fortner & Neimeyer, 1999; Harding et al., 2005; Jonas & Fischer, 2006; Kahoe & Dunn, 1975; Maltby & Day, 2000).

TMT extends the study of religion and death beyond the correlational, by providing an experimental framework through which the manipulation of MS and measurement of its effects are possible. Using this and similar approaches, experimenters have assessed the effects of death reminders on a range of religious beliefs with inconsistent results. Osarchuk and Tatz (1973) found that religiously committed individuals confronted with death reported greater belief in an afterlife, whereas others found no such effect (Berman, 1974; Ochsmann, 1984). In contrast, Dechesne et al. (2003) reported that participants given an essay arguing for an afterlife exhibited a weaker response to MS, indicating that belief in an afterlife may be protective against death anxiety.

Burling (1993) extended this research to religiosity broadly defined, finding that even highly religious individuals did not report increased religiosity after MS manipulation. Similarly, Peterson and Greil (1990) found that death experience only weakly lead to greater religiosity. On the other hand, Norenzayan and Hansen (2006) reported that not only did MS manipulation increase culturally congruent religiosity but it also increased belief in Buddha and Shamanic spirits primarily among Christians. Consequently, the role of death in religious motivation remains unclear and possible inter-faith and intra-faith differences require exploration.

Religion as culture

One theoretical perspective for investigating these possible differences is Cohen’s “religious culture” approach (Cohen, Malka, Rozin, & Cherfas, 2006), which contests the generally acknowledged ecumenical link between faith of any type and universal religious values. In contrast, a religious culture approach assumes that the claims of an individual’s particular faith will determine the relationship between their religiosity, values, and beliefs since presumably individuals espouse only those principles consistent with their specific religious doctrine. As a result, Cohen suggests that each religion, like geographic origin or ethnic identity, is best understood as a cultural influence that uniquely alters values, beliefs, practices, and social institutions.

When applied to Judaism, this religious culture approach identified a number of values and beliefs that theologically distinguish Judaism from Christianity, and empirically established parallel discrepancies between Christian and Jewish individuals. Most centrally, Cohen and colleagues suggest that internal mental states play a more significant role for Protestants than for Jews who emphasis actions over thoughts (Cohen & Rozin, 2001), practice over beliefs (Cohen, Siegel, & Rozin, 2003), repentance and restitution over...
forgiveness (Cohen et al., 2006), and religious participation over intrinsic motivation (Cohen & Hill, 2007). As a result, the Terror Management role of Jewish religiosity may differ from that of Christian faith, and furthermore substantial variability may exist between Orthodox and non-Orthodox Jews (Cohen et al., 2003; Schlosser, 2006). Hence, consistent with a religious culture approach, our focus on the Terror Management function of Orthodox Jewish religiosity necessitates description of traditional Judaism’s theological stance towards death and the afterlife.

**Life after death within Orthodox Judaism**

Orthodox Judaism is premised on the divine origination of the Torah (Hebrew Bible) and its many commandments, and adherents apply these biblical precepts, interpreted extensively in the Talmud, to every facet of their lives (Schnall, 2006). As exemplified by Maimonides’ (12th century/1990a) formulation of the 13 “principles of faith,” Orthodox Judaism strongly endorses spiritual values including belief in an afterlife. The Torah, however, never explicitly mentions life after death, and traditional rabbinic sources advance an ambiguous attitude towards a spiritual afterlife and its role in religious motivation (see Maimonides, 12th century/1990a). In fact, the Mishna (Pirkei Avos, 1:3) cautions “Do not be as a servant who serves his master in order to receive a reward but rather as a servant who serves his master without intent to be rewarded [Trans.].” Consequently, Orthodox Jewish belief may not necessarily include a salient and positive conceptualization of life after death, which may limit its relevance to TMT.

Furthermore, although Orthodox Judaism does not focus on the positive aspects of life after death, it does emphasize an ultimate judgment before a heavenly court. The Talmud (Shabbos, 31a) explicitly describes this process, “When a person enters judgment it is asked from him, did you to conduct your business trustfully? Did you set aside time for religious study? And did you establish a family? [Trans.]” In addition, while Judaism strongly supports God’s mercy and forgiveness towards sinners, these are not understood to be natural consequences of religious faith and restored belief alone. Rather, forgiveness is a gift granted by G-d requiring adherence to several conditions of sincere repentance (Rabbeinu Yonah, 12th century/1990), which may also necessitate specific religious services, appeasement or repayment of a victim, and even punishment and suffering (Maimonides, 12th century/1990b).

This theological framework suggests that Orthodox Jewish religiosity, despite supporting belief an afterlife, may not serve a Terror Management function. On the contrary, it may encourage greater apprehension of an ultimate accounting for past behaviour—a heavenly judgment unmitigated by religious belief alone.

**Orthodox Jewish subgroups**

Additionally, it is important to recognize that Orthodox Judaism is a broad categorization within which exists numerous subgroups defined by dress, language, culture, and religious emphasis. One key distinction is between the more religiously traditional and culturally isolated Ultra-Orthodox and more moderate Modern Orthodox (Loewenthal & Rogers, 2004). Furthermore, within Ultra-Orthodox Judaism it is also meaningful to distinguish Yiddish speaking “Chassidim,” who dress distinctively with long coats and side curls, are more “mystically oriented,” and strongly rely on their spiritual leaders; from English speaking “Yeshivish” who are somewhat more modern in dress but similarly culturally
isolated and religiously traditional (Shaked & Bilu, 2006; Margolese, 1998). In addition, within each Orthodox subgroup there are also “Baalei Teshuva” (BT), defined as those from less traditional backgrounds who have “returned” to Orthodox observance. Generally, BT appear to successfully integrate into their adopted community (Snow, Zemon, Schechter, Pirutinsky, & Langner, 2008) however, because of their dissimilar religious background and lack of childhood Orthodox education, their conceptualization of Judaism may vary significantly.

In summary, the goal of the present study was to examine if self-reported Orthodox Jewish religiosity is indeed uninfluenced, or perhaps even lowered, by MS manipulation as predicted by a religious culture approach, and to investigate if any of the constituent subgroups or BT “returnees” differ in their response. Furthermore, through an analysis of participant’s response to MS, we aim to establish if the expected theologically based conceptualizations are salient within the Orthodox Jewish reaction to death reminders.

Method

Participants

One hundred and thirty one participants were recruited from several Internet blogs, forums, and news outlets with Orthodox Jewish audiences. The resulting sample included a wide range of ages (18–84, $M = 39$), a mix across genders (males = 52%, females = 48%), and a variety of subgroup affiliations (Ultra-Orthodox = 36%, Modern Orthodox = 49%, non-Orthodox = 15%). Across all Orthodox groups there were 44 without religious change (40%), 47 BT (43%), and 19 who reported intra-orthodox religious change (17%). Of these participants, those who failed to complete items necessary for a particular analysis were excluded from it.

Measures

Demographics

Demographics were collected on a form asking for age, gender, current religious affiliation, and parental religious affiliation “when I grew up.” Religious affiliation allowed for numerous responses, for the purpose of analysis however all were collapsed into non-Orthodox, Modern Orthodox, and Ultra-Orthodox. We then assigned each Orthodox participant to a religious change category based on self-reported discrepancies between their current and parental affiliations. BT indicates currently Orthodox individuals reporting non-Orthodox parents, intra-orthodox change describes those whose affiliation differed from that of their Orthodox parents, and no-change included only those whose current religious affiliation was identical to that of their parents.

MS manipulation

The MS manipulation consisted of two open-ended questions commonly used in MS experiments (Cox & Arndt, 2006). In the experimental MS condition they read, “Please briefly describe the emotions that the thought of your own death arouses in you.” and “Jot down, as specifically as you can, what you think will happen to you as you physically die and once you are physically dead.” Participants in the control condition responded to similar questions referring to intense dental pain. Responses to the MS manipulation were
evaluated for mention of two a priori defined themes—fear of judgment and unification with God.

Religiosity measure
Despite the availability of well-developed scales commonly in use for Christian samples, truly examining Orthodox religiosity necessitates items specific to Jewish belief and practice. Consequently, to broadly capture intrinsic Orthodox religiosity, we developed a questionnaire that includes 11 statements about beliefs, feelings, and meaning in practices (Table 1), based on religious texts (Maimonides, 12th century/1990a), rituals, and previously used measures (Schechter, 2008). These items were rated on a 7-point Likert-like scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, and responses summed to form a single highly internally consistent measure ($\alpha = 0.92$) that successfully differentiated between individuals of each religious orientation, $F(2, 104) = 21.68, p < 0.001$ (Figure 1).

Procedure
Participants were recruited through a website informing the goals and methods of the research, and were invited to participate. Those consenting were randomly directed to either the experimental or control form containing all materials. The MS manipulation

Table 1. Orthodox Jewish religiosity measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My religion influences everything I do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the Torah was given to Moshe by G-d at Sinai.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to observe halacha [religious law] as carefully as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe G-d directs and controls the world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My religious observance is primarily out of social expectation. [reverse-scored]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe G-d loves all His creations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that G-d is always accessible to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel G-d listens to my prayers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel Divine intervention (hashgacha) within my life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in G-d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I say Brochos [blessings] with Kavaana [devotion].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Mean religiosity by affiliation.
was presented first, preceded by a larger survey not analyzed for this paper. Participants then completed a portion of the Intolerance for Ambiguity Scale from Budner (1962), a demographics section, and were introduced to the religiosity questionnaire. In the control condition, they were subsequently presented with the MS death questions for the purpose of qualitative analysis. After completing the survey, participants were informed of the experimental nature of the research in greater detail, and were invited to leave their comments or suggestions.

Results

Effect of MS manipulation

Consistent with our expectation, a two-way ANOVA, examining the effects of MS manipulation and religious affiliation on intrinsic Jewish religiosity, revealed no significant difference between the MS and control groups, $F(1, 104) = 0.037, p = 0.848$. On the other hand, religious affiliation significantly differentiated between groups, $F(2, 104) = 21.68, p < 0.001$, indicating that both Ultra-Orthodox and Modern Orthodox participants were more religious than Non-Orthodox (Figure 1). Additionally, the lack of interaction between religious affiliation and MS condition, $F(1, 104) = 0.472, p = 0.625$, suggests that among Jews of all denominations MS does not lead to increased religiosity.

An additional ANOVA, investigating the effects of MS and religious change (Table 2), showed that intrinsic religiosity did not vary significantly by MS condition or religious change. Nevertheless, these factors interacted such that BT and individuals with intra-orthodox religious change self-reported higher levels of intrinsic religiosity in the MS condition, whereas participants with no religious change reported lower, as compared with similar individuals within the dental control group (Figure 2). Moreover, a post-hoc $t$-test, aggregating all orthodox individuals with religious change, revealed a significant difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>161.86</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS $\times$ religious change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>457.58</td>
<td>3.984</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>114.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Religiosity by MS condition and religious change.
between the MS and control conditions, \( t(59) = 2.16, p = 0.035 \), and a similar test among those without change was nearly significant, \( t(32) = -1.71, p = 0.097 \).

**Analysis of MS response**

Among Orthodox participants, an identical 27.3% of both those with Religious change and those without mentioned a fear of judgment in their response to MS, such as “I will go up to heaven and be judged for all of my actions in this lifetime.” On the other hand, while 28.8% of participants with religious change indicated that they would be “meeting Hashem (God)” after death, only a significant 9.1% of those without change stated likewise, \( \chi^2(1, 110) = 6.19, p = 0.013 \).

**Discussion**

A religious culture approach (Cohen et al., 2006) implies that Judaism’s theological ambiguity concerning an exclusively positive spiritual afterlife may preclude a Terror Management function for Jewish religiosity, and that furthermore a focus on heavenly judgment may motivate decreased religiosity in response to MS. Consistent with this suggestion, we found that MS did not significantly influence the self-reported intrinsic religiosity of non-Orthodox Jews. Moreover, among Orthodox reporting no religious change MS seemingly lowered religiosity, despite the apparent worldview the all-encompassing creed of Judaism represents for them. These results, taken along with the strong proportion of respondents indicating a fear of ultimate judgment, suggest that the religious culture approach can advance future research examining the empirical links between religiosity and TMT.

Furthermore, although Orthodox individuals without religious change appear to lower their religiosity when reminded of death, BT “returnees,” reported greater religiosity in the MS condition. Nevertheless, the pattern of these results does not support the suggestion that the non-orthodox background of BT alters their response to MS, since those indicating intra-orthodox religious change exhibit similarly increased religiosity. Instead, it appears that religious “converts” generally, whether from Orthodox or Non-Orthodox backgrounds, differ in their utilization of religion in coping with death anxiety. Consequently, these results highlight the need for further research examining the acquisition of Orthodox Jewish belief and its consequences.

**Attachment and religious change**

One possible direction is suggested by Ringel’s (2008) exploration of the formation of faith among Orthodox Jewish women, which delineates non-BT, whose beliefs are “shaped by attachment bonds with family and community,” from BT who report transformative and solitary religious experiences. This dichotomy is well supported by a larger body of research synthesized by Granqvist and Kirkpatrick (2008), who describe the strong parallels between attachment theory and religious belief, concluding that “many aspects of religious belief and experience...reflect (at least in part) the operation of attachment processes” (p. 925). Accordingly, Granqvist and Kirkpatrick developed two hypotheses describing the acquisition of religious beliefs. One, compensation, occurs when inadequate attachment support leads individuals from less religious backgrounds to seek a substitute attachment figure in a loving and caring G-d. Conversely, correspondence takes place
when securely attached religious parents socialize their children into religious belief, who then form a corresponding internal working model of a similarly compassionate G-d. Numerous studies support the existence of both pathways (see Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, 2008), and these two models, compensation for BT and correspondence for Non-BT, strongly parallel Ringel’s (2008) descriptions. Furthermore, research contrasting perceived attachment history among Orthodox Jews revealed that those who report religious change are far more likely to characterize their childhood relationship with their mother as insecure (Pirutinsky, 2008), and previous research supports the existence of strong attachment-like relationships with God among BT (Sands, Rapoport-Spero, & Danzig, 2007).

Moreover, Granqvist (2005) results suggest that only those whose beliefs developed through compensation rely on God as a surrogate attachment figure to help regulate distress. On the other hand, for those whose religious beliefs evolved through socialized correspondence, God seems unrelated to distress regulation. Thus, despite their secure working model of a loving God, “correspondents” do not seem to benefit from their religion to the same extent as “compensators” (Brown, Nesse, House, & Utz, 2004; Granqvist, 2005; Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, 2008). These findings echo those of the present study, as individuals’ reporting religious change strongly reaffirmed this protective religious attachment when confronted with MS, despite that fact that their co-religionists without religious change lowered their reported belief. Consequently, future research may extend our findings beyond MS, given that individuals with varying religious histories appear to employ differential religious coping strategies more generally. Particularly intriguing are possible differences in the relevance of religious beliefs to mental health, and in the utility of religion and spirituality in psychotherapy among Orthodox Jews.

Limitations
This research was limited by the use of a completely Internet-based recruitment and participation strategy due to the generally distrustful attitude of these communities toward psychological enquiry. Thus, participants may have self-selected based on an interest in Orthodox religiosity, which may have yielded a more reactive sample. Furthermore, the more religious and conservative subgroups of Orthodox Judaism generally do not access the Internet, which prevented a more exhaustive analysis of subgroup differences. Also, although the religiosity measure used has strong face validity, successfully differentiated between religious subgroups, and was highly internally consistent, its psychometric properties have not yet been fully established.

Conclusion
In conclusion, Jewish response to MS, although generally consistent with a religious culture approach, varied significantly between individuals reporting religious change and those without. Clearly, deaths relationship with religion is not a monolithic truth, but rather a fluctuating bond dependent on inter- and intra-faith factors. There may be differences between “converts,” who possibly attain belief through compensation, and those who received religion through socialized correspondence. Furthermore, dissimilar faiths and denominations may utilize religion in disparate ways. Consequently, recognizing the possibility of these differences and examining them is vital to understanding how religion copes with death, and perhaps even with life.
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